



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/298,726	04/23/1999	VALTER MADDALON	06023-71(MI/	2377

570 7590 02/19/2003

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-7013

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.K.

Interview SummaryApplication No.
09/298,726Applicant(s)
MaddalonExaminer
Clark F. DexterArt Unit
3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Richard Woldin

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 13, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Roy et al., pn 5,586,479Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Woldin submitted a proposed amended claim 1 along with proposed new claims 9-12 (attached in file). Applicant's position is that the prior art does not teach or suggest a trimming device as claimed wherein a microprocessor has stored therein stored line intensities and stored line sizes, and wherein the microprocessor recognizes a boundary mark based on the detection by both first and second optical sensors and by a comparison between the stored intensity and the detected intensity of the black and white lines wherein the comparison results in the detected intensity being within a predetermined threshold based on the stored intensity of the black and white lines. Mr. Dexter stated that such proposed limitations appear to obviate the prior art rejection, but would require further consideration and/or search. Mr. Dexter noted that claim 12, which is directed to a method, may or may not be examined based on whether a restriction is warranted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724**

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.